


B1
cont

(IV)



wherein R¹⁰, R¹¹, R¹² and R¹³ are independently hydrogen, alkyl, fluoroalkyl, fluorocarbonol or an acid-cleavable moiety, with the proviso that at least one of R¹⁰, R¹¹, R¹² and R¹³ is an acid-cleavable moiety.

REMARKS

With the present amendment, a minor and inadvertent error in claim 98 has been corrected. The claim now depends from claim 67, as should have been recited initially, rather than from claim 96. The amendment does not add any new matter, and the amended claim is supported throughout the specification wherever copolymers of the invention are described.

Applicants are also submitting a Declaration of the inventors under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 to address the applicability of two publications submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement filed with the subject application, "Silicon-Containing Resists for 157 nm Applications," *SPIE's 26th Annual International Symposium and Education Program on Microlithography* (abstract 4345-35, Session 8) (February 26, 2001) (Reference BP on the PTO-1449), and "Silicon-Containing Resists for 157 nm Applications," *Proceedings of SPIE - Advances in Resist Technology and Processing XVIII* 4345: 319-326 (February 26, 2001) (Reference BQ on the PTO-1449), both co-authored by Ratnam Sooriyakumaran, Debra Fenzel-Alexander, Nicolette Fender, Gregory M. Wallraff, and Robert D. Allen. The Declaration indicates that the named inventors on the present application--Ratnam Sooriyakumaran, Robert David Allen, and Debra Fenzel-Alexander--are the only joint inventors of the subject matter presently claimed, and that the other individuals named as co-authors on the aforementioned publications are not co-inventors herein. Rather, as indicated in the Declaration, both Dr. Fender and Dr. Wallraff were working under the direction of the named joint inventors, and neither Dr. Fender nor Dr. Wallraff contributed to the conception of the invention claimed in the present application.

Pursuant to Section 715.01(c) of the M.P.E.P., then, the Sooriyakumaran et al. publications do not represent prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) because the publications describe applicants' own work.

-102(e)
to another?


See also *In re Katz*, 687 F.2d 450, 215 USPQ 14 (CCPA 1982), the leading case on point, cited in the
aforementioned section of the M.P.E.P.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this communication, or wish to discuss the
application as search and examination are initiated, please contact the undersigned attorney at (650) 330-
0900.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

6/11/02



Dianne E. Reed
Reg. No. 31,292

REED & ASSOCIATES
800 Menlo Avenue, Suite 210
Menlo Park, CA 94025
Telephone (650) 330-0903
Facsimile (650) 330-0980